UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

SOCIAL JUSTICE NUMBER

Issued in Coöperation with
the Unitarian Fellowship
for Social Justice

VOLUME CXX NUMBER 4

Chicago, October 18, 1937

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 51
A Fellowship for Social Justice—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 53
ARTICLES—
The Coöperative Way of Social Action—JAMES PETER WARBASSE 54
The Outlook for Civil Liberties—ROGER N. BALDWIN 56
The Way of a Pacifist—PAUL JONES 57
The Effort to Stamp Out Syphilis in This Country—ARTHUR WILLIAM STILLIANS 58
Education for Democracy and the Good Life—WALTER A. ANDERSON 60
Voluntary Parenthood—BERNARD FANTUS 61
American Labor Organizes—HAROLD P. MARLEY 62
Peace Tactics for the Present Crisis—JOHN NEVIN SAYRE 64
The Union Label—JOHN PAUL JONES 67
TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
Fashionable Church—MARY WARD 59
Factory Girl (To D. M.)—VINCENT BURNS 59
The Dance Upon Nothing—GORDON LECLAIRE 59
"Let There Be Light"—V. FRIEDERIKA VAN BUSKIRK 59
POETRY—
In Springfield Station—VINCENT BURNS 63
THE FIELD—
Religious Liberals! Enroll for Social Action—EDWIN H. WILSON, President 50

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Religious Liberals! Enroll for Social Action

With this issue of UNITY, sponsored by the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice and made possible by the coöperation of the UNITY Editors, we present the 1937-1938 platform of the Fellowship together with articles intended to give substance to the platform and to show its implications for united liberal action. This platform, voted at the annual meeting in May, is not intended to be a test of membership, but an effort to reflect present trends and to set objectives. Criticism of the platform with a view to its development in later years is an essential part of the year's work. Membership in the U.F.S.J. does not indicate detailed approval of the platform nor, necessarily, membership in the Unitarian or any other household of faith, but rather a desire to coöperate in study and action with a liberal church group. We are now beginning a *national enrollment of religious liberals for social action* and, in distributing this issue of UNITY widely, invite not only socially progressive Unitarians, Universalists, and the readers of UNITY, but all liberals not otherwise affiliated with a church group for social action to join our organization.

The rise of independent and determined social action councils or fellowships within several denominations offers liberalism a unique opportunity for a united front coördination and motivation of its activities on a basis of moral idealism rather than violent force. If both churched and unchurched liberals rally at once to the support of the church social action group nearest in terms of distance or ideas, these groups coöperating through the United Christian Council for Social Action can correct one of the weaknesses of present liberalism. Divided into numerous highly specialized organizations devoted to the furtherance of some special issue liberals become exhausted and their movements weakened by competing factions. No one reading the material presented in this issue of UNITY can fail to be impressed by the overlapping interests of liberal educators, ministers, physicians, social workers, labor leaders, and others. Mazzini's appeal for unity in defense of freedom, "Let us make ourselves great and strong by association," is echoed today in the opportunity afforded by the heightened social interests of the churches. On a level above doctrinal barriers churches confront humanity with their ethical teachings concerning the supreme value of human personality, the necessity that all institutions serve man in his effort to achieve the life abundant in a world at peace, and the unity of man in one world brotherhood. Here is center and motive with the prestige of the church behind it uniting all men of good will. We ask for a thousand religious liberals to help us make the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice worthy of the interdenominational movement and a power for progress. Five new members from every Unitarian

(*Continued on page* 67)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXX MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1937 No. 4

LIBERTY FOR ALL

They tell me Liberty! that in thy name
I may not plead for all the human race;
That some are born to bondage and disgrace,
Some to a heritage of woe and shame,
And some to power supreme, and glorious fame;
With my whole soul I spurn the doctrine base,
And, as an equal brotherhood, embrace
All people, and for all fair freedom claim!

—*William Lloyd Garrison*

A SOCIAL PLATFORM FOR THESE DAYS

UNITY takes satisfaction in commending to its readers the 1937-1938 program and platform of the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice as printed in this issue. This statement of purpose has admirable features. We like first of all the dating of the program—1937-38! This obviously signifies that a new program may be expected another year—that time works its changes, and the alert mind and consecrated heart must be ready ever for the new objectives that lead to progress. Secondly, we like the concreteness of the ends and aims as stated in the opening paragraphs. Usually these pronunciamentos begin with high-sounding generalities which may or may not mean anything, and frequently they end with these generalities. But here are specific purposes—civil liberties as defended by the American Civil Liberties Union, the coöperative movement, academic freedom, opposition to compulsory military training, birth control, the union label, etc. Happily, also, general principles and ideals are not forgotten, as witness items 11 and 12. We especially welcome item 12, with its definite insistence that religion must have direct "concern for human welfare." We wish that this statement might have been amplified, as it is central to the whole problem of spiritual idealism in relation to society. The great weakness of the program, the one inexcusable omission, is in the matter of war. Why is the Fellowship silent on war as the crime of crimes against society, the sin of sins against man and God? Why does it not denounce war as antithetical to everything that religion stands for and therefore irreconcilable under any conditions with the religious life? It is true that the Fellowship pleads for exemption from military service on conscientious grounds, but this is not enough. The most savage warrior might have the decency to excuse from his armies those who did not believe in bearing arms. The Fellowship should itself declare that "war is wrong," and dedicate its members to the fight against it. Let us hope that the Fellowship will take this stand in the new 1938-1939 platform!

ANOTHER SOCIAL JUSTICE GROUP

Corresponding to the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice in the Unitarian body is the Church League for Industrial Democracy in the Episcopalian body. This Church League has been having trouble at the Triennial Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church recently held at Cincinnati. Bishop Manning, in true pontifical fashion, started the row with a letter addressed to various Episcopalian journals, which was widely published in the secular press. In this letter the Bishop protested against the "great prominence" given the C. L. I. D. on "the official program" of the Convention. He complained against the one-sided nature of the League's meetings and asserted that its activities were touched "with more than a tinge of Communism." That admirable weekly, the *Churchman,* disposed neatly of the Bishop's complaint of one-sidedness by stating that "his real objection is to [the League's] *other-sidedness.* . . . There will be no dearth of representation at the Convention of both the conservative and reactionary points of view." A little later in the controversy came a statement of the Church Laymen's Association, strongly backing up Bishop Manning. Asserting that the Church League for Industrial Democracy "appears to advocate the principles of Marxian Socialism," reminding that "the primary function of the Christian Church is to teach spiritual truths," declaring that "any organization . . . clinging to the fringe of the Church, espousing and promoting Communism . . . is striking directly at the heart of the Church and the Christian religion," the Laymen demanded that the League be given no official recognition or indorsement. We think the Laymen need not worry—the Convention will keep the League safely out in the cold! But meanwhile one of the most distinguished and honored of all Episcopal laymen, Charles Burlingham, of New York, lawyer and publicist, has

spoken out in defense of the League's right to be heard, and the *Churchman* presents the real issue as one of "free speech." It is to the everlasting credit of the Unitarians that they have forced no such experience as this upon the Fellowship for Social Justice. The Fellowship has at times been none too popular, but no church leader has ever spoken out against it, and place has always been granted it on the official program with due protection against chronological conflict with other meetings. Also, the Appraisal Committee gave it earnest and sympathetic study. The Unitarians, in other words, have been faithful to their own and Christianity's and America's principles of freedom.

SPIRITUAL SCOUTS

Why should not every church have a radical group like the Fellowship for Social Justice in the Unitarian body and the League for Industrial Democracy in the Episcopalian body? The Congregationalists have a superbly intelligent and courageous Social Service Committee, the Methodists have Harry F. Ward's ever alert and aggressive society—there are undoubtedly other groups in other churches! But why should not every church have its advance guard of scouts to be thrown out into the enemy's country, to find the way, to reconnoiter the field, to prepare for the march of the main body of followers. The military figure of speech is here inevitable! No army, no nation, no church, no society, no mass of any kind, can move promptly. There must be elaborate preparation for every forward step, and the step when taken must be firm and sure. The great danger in the movement of any organization is that of getting the forces divided or scattered. The main body must in every case be held together—which means that the speediest elements of the body can move no faster than the slowest. Meanwhile, however, always in advance of the main body the road must be built or cleared, and much farther in advance the land must be spied out and the path of progress through the wilderness securely found. This pioneering work is always hazardous—the scouts may lose their way, they may go too far and be cut off, they may be deceived and bring back false reports. But the work must be done, and those in the main army should be the first to support and acclaim these pioneers. In Kenneth Roberts's popular novel, *Northwest Passage,* the author tells us about Roger's Rangers. These men were rash as well as brave; they launched out into their own campaigns, sometimes in defiance of the high command; they were despised and hated, even feared, by the officials and all respectables. But they did pioneering and fighting work that had to be done, and opened up many a fair country to later settlement and occupation. Translate pioneer or scout into radical, and we make the transition from the military figure of speech to the spiritual reality of religion.

THE PASSING OF SOCIALISM

Harold Laski, writing in a recent issue of the *Nation* about the English Trades Union Congress, comments on the fact that Socialism was not mentioned in the deliberations of that body. Norman Thomas, American Socialist leader, has withdrawn his mayoralty candidacy in New York, and is supporting Mr. La Guardia in the interest of the American Labor Party. Mr. Blum, French Socialist, gained his premiership in 1936 as a coalition leader, and sees his party slowly but surely being swallowed up by the merging political interests of the Left. Everywhere there seems to be passing the old Socialism of a generation ago. There was a time when 'Gene Debs was marshalling a million votes behind his banners, and talking of forcing a merger of the two old parties to meet the so-called menace of the Socialist Party. Now the party is so weak in numbers and influence, so rent by warring factions, as to be a negligible force in public affairs. In England, the British Labor Party, Socialist through and through, marched steadily forward under J. Ramsay MacDonald—the balance-of-power cabinets were regarded as last steps toward the attainment of majority control of the Commons! But now the party has degenerated into a kind of later version of Liberalism, and nothing seems quite so remote as a Socialist government in Westminster. In France, as we have seen, Socialism is almost completely absorbed as an independent political force. In Germany and Italy it has been wiped out. What seems to be evident is that Socialism, of the pre-War variety, was distinctly a democratic process—it was the method by which political or parliamentary democracy was going to work its way through to economic freedom for the masses. Now has come a new age, with Fascism contending with Communism, and both with democracy, for the mastery of our world. Marxism is still here, but it has taken the weapons of violence and terror, and, like Fascism, would destroy democracy to attain its end. It is from this standpoint that the passing of Socialism is ominous for the whole democratic cause.

THE RADIO AND PREACHING

Father James M. Gillis, for twelve years past an effective radio preacher, declares that "preaching is losing its power and life because of the microphone." He asserts that the radio cannot transmit personality, and that this is fatal since, as Phillips Brooks insisted in his famous Yale Lectures, personality is central to preaching. Furthermore, there is the fact that religion, in its essence, is "a flame, a fire, a battle," and the radio message must be "polite and inoffensive." The conclusion is that radio preaching may entertain a parlor, perhaps console a sick-room, but never launch a crusade. That Father Gillis is right in his judgment we believe few people will deny. Preaching on the radio

is as pitiful as acting on the radio—both for the same reason that the contagion of personality is missing. As well try to light a fire by striking a match in a vacuum as to kindle souls by breathing a prayer or speaking a sermon in a broadcasting studio. But there is another aspect of this radio business which Father Gillis does not mention, and which we deem of great importance. We refer to the fact that radio preaching, for obvious reasons, is manuscript preaching. The radio preacher, like the radio speaker, or indeed the radio actor, has his text before him, and proceeds forthwith to read—and reading, we insist, is not preaching! If this fact were confined to the broadcasting studio, it might not be so bad. What is positively alarming is the spread of the studio influence to the pulpit itself. Many of our best preachers are suddenly returning to their manuscripts. *Ex tempore* preaching, which a generation ago was becoming well-nigh universal, is now steadily diminishing. The same thing is true on the platform as in the pulpit. Go to a political rally, or a public meeting of any kind, and see speaker after speaker get up before the microphone, or perhaps only an amplifier, and read solemnly and dully from a prepared text! This reliance upon the manuscript is bad enough anywhere; it is fatal to preaching. Given a few more years of this pernicious influence, and preaching will be dead.

A Fellowship for Social Justice

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The fine tradition of social idealism identified with religious liberalism in the work of William Ellery Channing, Theodore Parker, and the Transcendentalists is maintained today as a living force by the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, to which UNITY gladly dedicates this issue of its paper. Founded thirty years ago, this organization has marked for a full generation the left wing of Unitarianism and therewith has perpetuated the progressive and heroic spirit of the early day.

It is amazing to what an extent the social idealism of Unitarian Christianity in America seemed to disappear in the second half of the last century. Militant in Channing (see his addresses on labor), triumphant in Theodore Parker (see his sermons on social questions), it reached its climax in the great anti-slavery crusade and the war for the Union. That crusade and that war seemed to exhaust the idealism of the American people. There followed a dreadful era of political corruption and social debauchery, followed by a gigantic and yet sordid era of industrial expansion, both of which were periods of materialism and moral decay. The Unitarians, like all Christians, suffered the "sea change" of the times. Transcendentalism, as a vast movement of thought and inner life in the Unitarian churches, gave way to what George Willis Cooke called a movement of church extension. Caught up into the swirling tides of national development, New England Unitarianism went driving into the middle and the far West, and in churches scattered like seed to the Pacific coast took on a national but strictly denominational character. There had been Unitarian churches in the West before, but they were isolated and lonely, like mission stations. It was only after the Civil War that liberal Christianity became something more than merely a New England sect.

Now central to this Unitarian extension movement was a theological interest. Theodore Parker was remembered for his controversies over questions of God, the Bible, and the person of Jesus; Channing survived in a hard-and-fast Channing Unitarianism, which knew much of Channing's letter but little of his spirit. This theological concern of the Unitarians, animated as it was by a contagious ideal and method of freedom, spread into the West and found rootage in the soil plowed by Thomas Paine and harrowed by Robert Ingersoll. In so far, that is, as Unitarianism, in its spread beyond the New England confines, did not merely follow the beaten track of Yankee pilgrimages to the Mississippi and beyond, it touched rationalists and free-thinkers and gathered these into the fold of liberalism. The result was an absorption in theological thought, with a cleavage between theological conservatives east of the Hudson and theological radicals west, which resulted in the great new controversy of "the Western Issue." The details of this controversy, which bulks so large in the history of American Unitarianism, do not here concern us. What is important at this point is that, with the exception of a few such unique figures as Jenkin Lloyd Jones, the whole period, culminating with the close of the nineteenth century, was dominated by theology. The social idealism of the earlier day had almost entirely disappeared! It was a theological pronunciamento, the famous Saratoga platform, which ended a controversy and at the same time dropped the curtain upon an era of Unitarian history.

Meanwhile, the modern social question had appeared. The first faint sparks of that radicalism, which has since sprung into a conflagration, had illumined the horizon. These sparks touched some kindling material in the Unitarian body which preserved the old Trandscendental idealism. Here and there were clergymen, like George Willis Cooke, curiously the historian of the American Unitarian Association, who became Christian Socialists. A great scholar, Francis G. Peabody, caught the vision of the new religious day,

and wrote books which were pioneer works in the field of the social applications of Christianity. Edward Everett Hale, with his overflowing human interests, carried religion into every field of social endeavor which caught his imagination and stirred his heart. But Unitarians as a body proved impervious to the new influences of the times. They had become hardened to narrow theological viewpoints. But there was another and still more potent influence at work! Unitarianism in America was predominantly a middle class movement; in the East, the movement reached from the upper middle class up into the aristocracy, while in the West it reached from the upper middle class down into the lower middle class. In neither region did the movement touch the workers—that proletarian class from which the new social idealism of the day was proceeding. Instinctively the Unitarians, as intelligent as they were class-conscious, felt what this idealism really meant. It was revolution stirring in the depths—it was a new class rising to claim its own. And they were afraid!

It was just at the time when the first tension was beginning to appear in Unitarian ranks, as in the middle class generally in America, over this stupendous question of social justice in a capitalistic society, that the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice appeared. To the little group of youthful founders, there seemed nothing new in their proclamation of social faith. It was easy to explain and defend their position with words found in abundance in Channing, Parker, Emerson, and their contemporaries. The Fellowship was simply reviving a spirit and a tradition, an outlook and a vision, a philosophy of life and an interpretation of Christianity, which were a commonplace of religious prophecy. But new times had come—these times were dangerous—and the gospel of social radicalism met something of the same spirit of bitter antagonism and persecution which overwhelmed Parker in his youth and darkened the eyes of Channing in his old age. It was the story which has been since the beginning of the world—the fear of truth in the age which it sears and burns!

For a full generation, now, the Fellowship for Social Justice has carried on. It did not, as it could not, foresee the times through which it must live—the upheaval of an age and the possible collapse of a civilization! But it has not dimmed its light nor lowered its colors in the face of what have seemed to be disasters inwrought in the very substance of its thought. If radicalism in religion means revolution in society—so be it! There *is* a way to security and peace—the way of justice, brotherhood, and love. If the world will not take this way, then we must weep, as Jesus wept over a Jerusalem which he could not save. But we must go on, in fidelity to God and to his truth, even though it be to Gethsemane, Calvary, and the earthquake and great darkness.

The Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice has preserved a sacred tradition which might have been lost to the liberal religion of our day. It has caught a vision of the new heaven and the new earth, which must be transmitted to our children and our children's children. The Fellowship's task was never so heavy, nor so important, as in this direful age. God give it strength to endure and faith to lead, until the promise of God's kingdom is at last fulfilled in the commonwealth of man!

The Coöperative Way of Social Action

JAMES PETER WARBASSE

People grow impatient at the slowness of social reforms, and turn to what are thought to be the quick ways. They want totalitarian results. I once advocated the coöperative method in a meeting of the unemployed and was told: "we shall all be starved and dead by the time it can solve our problems." Still, I believe the best way to deal with a bad condition is to apply temporary relief and then set on foot the means to prevent its recurrence. Unfortunately, if the ownership, or even the administration of the essential properties and machinery were transferred to the hands of the unemployed, it would be found in highly inefficient hands. The people who can best administer industries are the people who have developed their cunning by administering industries. And neither suffering, reading, listening to orations, nor even voting, trains people for these functions.

Here are two urgent questions. What is the quick way to establish a more workable economic system? And how may the people be trained to assume the responsibility for producing and supplying themselves directly? The two may be answered together.

By the coöperative method, people are not confiscating anything; they are not setting up a revolution; they are not aiming at a cataclysmic change. They are beginning at the bottom and learning how to produce and supply themselves with the things and services they need. They begin in a small way, and when they have learned how to do small things they move on to big things. The slow way, or—more properly speaking—what may be called the sure way, proves to be the quick way.

When the coöperative consumers league in Switzerland acquired 51 per cent of the stock of the beef trust, and the price of meat went down for the consumers and the farmers got more for their live stock, these were not the two most important facts. What is still more important, the coöperatively organized consumers from that moment on began to get experience in training themselves to administer the meat business, not to get profits from other people but to get meat to themselves.

Such experiences occur in retail distribution, wholesaling, and manufacturing, in the fields of every useful

commodity. Banking, insurance, medical care, recreation, and other useful services are steadily coming under this coöperative method of ownership and administration. The people who need the service are training themselves to control, administer, and own the service.

Three reactions against the decay of capitalism and the resulting expansion of stateism are to be seen. The first is the prevalent attitude as displayed by American business, taking the position that the old ways are best, that economic changes are disastrous, that people who entertain ideas of a different sort of economic system are wicked, and that if business can be left alone to do what it will to labor on the one hand and to the consumers on the other all will be well. It is this non-compromising and non-constructive attitude on the part of our most influential class that is moving the world on to disaster.

The second attitude to be observed in this seething situation is one of belligerency. It is the fascist approach to the problem. Recognizing the tendency toward community of action, it uses autocratic force to combat the rising socialistic tide. In the end, it is destined to go down in collapse as have all of the autocracies the world has ever seen.

The third alternative to the expansion of stateism is the coöperative method. This is a form of private business. It represents the wider distribution of stock ownership. It is conducted not for the purpose of getting the difference between the cost and selling prices from somebody else, but for the purpose of directly supplying the people who own the business with the things they want for their own use. A consumers coöperative association represents a union of people who pool their resources for the purposes of supplying themselves better and more economically than others can supply them. The aim is service instead of profits. Coöperation changes the motive and nature of business.

The method of coöperative business is especially developed in the most highly civilized countries. It continuously expands. In some of these countries it has became the predominant method of business. There is no useful commodity and few useful services which the coöperatively organized consumers do not supply to themselves. Beginning with retail distribution, their societies federate and form wholesales. The wholesales, after mastering big business, then proceed with manufacturing. The last step is ownership of the sources of raw materials. In the field of raw materials are such coöperative sources as coal mines, forests for lumber, fishing fleets, plantations and farm lands for the production of many commodities—owned by consumers for their services.

It is a notable fact that, amid the crashing of every kind of profit business during these past seven years, there is no instance of the failure of a coöperative consumers wholesale or manufacturing business in any one of the thirty countries whose wholesales are members of the International Coöperative Wholesale Society; and the failures of coöperative retail distributive businesses are inconsiderable in comparison with those of profit business. This is in the presence of the fact that the total business of the world's 250,000 consumers coöperative societies, in 1936, amounted to over 25 billion dollars.

In the United States coöperative consumers societies have developed slowly. At present there are over 12,000 of these organizations, with 4,000,000 members. Their total business amounts to about $500,000,000 a year. This is small in comparison with the total commerce of the country, but it represents a kind of business which constitutes a foundation of stability in our economic structure. Its notable successes are in the fields of insurance, credit, housing, farm supplies, petroleum products, electricity, and retail distribution. All of these are steadily expanding. The coöperative organization of medical service, controlled by the patients and prospective patients, is a development now attracting much attention.

The American coöperative movement is opposed to any coöperative consumers society accepting a subsidy from the Government. The acceptance of subsidies is the evidence of the decay of a business structure. A coöperative must succeed as a business on its own merits and by its own efficiency. When coöperatives borrow money, they must offer adequate security and guaranties of repayment.

In contrast to the subsidies enjoyed by profit business, the multitude of coöperative electric supply societies, now being organized under the Rural Electrification Administration, asks for none. While these societies are accepting loans from the Government, the security and the guaranties of interest payments are of such a nature as to place these loans among the best investments our Government has.

As coöperative business expands, there is a diminishing need of government control. I may cite as an example, the slaughtering and meat packing plant of a coöperative consumers society in the state of Ohio. The government need not employ inspectors to see that this plant does not send out diseased meat. There is no motive here to violate the pure food law. The ownership of the plant is vested in the people who eat the meat. And this business needs no machinery of government to prevent it from doing damage to consumers. People have no advantage in cheating themselves; it is always somebody else who thinks he can profit by so doing. And to protect non-coöperative consumers the government must maintain armies of inspectors, as well as laws, courts, and penalties. This principle runs through the whole fabric of consumers' coöperation.

Coöperation is business run for the service of the people, owned and controlled by the people whom it serves. For a hundred years, its progress, the world over, has shown a continuous upward curve—in good times, in bad times, in peace and in war. While such forces as Communism and Fascism retard it temporarily, nothing stops its penetration into every corner of the world. It sets people working together in the spirit of mutual aid, and promotes friendship and good will.

And yet this coöperative method of business encounters many obstacles. For its success, it must depend upon human beings with all their fallibility. Incompetence and dishonesty appear. Societies fail because of the sheer indifference of the members. Hostile to coöperation is the dominant capitalism which controls governments and which expresses itself in Fascism when driven to extremes and when its end seems imminent. In the United States the temper of the people is not coöperative. There is a disposition on the part of each individual to hope to get ahead of the others. To win, to acquire much property, to make a big killing possesses the minds of the masses.

Coöperation can succeed only as it goes on side by side with an ethical movement to make better individuals. Essential to the success of coöperation is every kind of teaching and training that gives people a better sense of values, of justice, and of beauty.

The Outlook for Civil Liberties

ROGER N. BALDWIN

Despite the incessant attacks on the rights of somebody or other, it is becoming plain that at the point of greatest tension—the struggle between capital and labor—rights are more freely exercised than they have been in years. The marked improvement is to be credited to the machinery set up by the government in the National Labor Relations Board, the tardy recognition by business that collective bargaining has come to stay, and the vigor of the new drive for organizing the great unorganized industries.

Not in years have I seen a situation so hopeful for the freedom of labor to organize, strike, and picket —the rights most commonly attacked—as in a recent tour of the steel and automobile districts of the middle West. This is the critical center of American industry. Once rights are won there, even the slow South and the intransigent Pacific Coast will catch up. The Tom Girdlers are only the survivors of a rugged individualism fast yielding to those governmental controls of industry and labor relations which the Tories have so long fought.

That this is not too optimistic a picture is attested by the increasing disarmament of the employers' agencies of force in resisting trade unionism. Under the impact of exposures by the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, the leading detective agencies for labor espionage, the spies, stool pigeons, and strike breakers, are out of their accustomed jobs. Under the intervention of the National Labor Relations Board, collective bargaining advances at a steady rate all over the country. Local police, so long dominated by the employers, tend to transfer the responsibility for handling industrial strife to the federal agencies. Mass picketing, long prohibited or curtailed, is now generally permitted, where peaceful. Labor injunctions are a comparative rarity. Troops are called out only on equally rare occasions.

It may well be argued that since the collapse of the "little steel" strike in July, there has been no major occasion for the use of force against strikers. But the signs are clear that the organizing work of the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L., with an unprecedented number of organizers in the field, is building a solid foundation under labor's rights. The next great strike will not catch them unprepared. It will find them with strong allies. Already local political organizations in the hands of labor are threatening to take control of one company town after another to insure fair policing of strikes.

Vigilantes organized as "citizens committees" to maintain "law and order" in the steel and automobile strikes are emergency organizations not to be found in the absence of strikes. These mushroom growths cannot be combatted by any force in times of comparative industrial peace save by building up the counter forces which will neutralize them in times of strife.

Radicals, and even many liberals, find it difficult to believe that the employing class in the United States will accept collective bargaining without violent resistance. The majority of them have already, reluctantly of course. Their efforts now are centered on taming labor by demanding their own rights under a rewritten labor relations act; by urging the incorporation of trade unions and public financial accounting. As in other fields of regulation, the regulated hope to become the regulators.

So vast a change in the field of civil rights in the United States is in fact only a conservative advance, comparable to what has for so many years marked industrial relations in England, Australia, Canada, and many European countries. In the United States it is still attacked, as is the whole New Deal itself, as a prelude to Communism. For the reactionaries never cease their propaganda against progress to preserve the status quo by characterizing every pro-labor measure as communistic.

That this tactic is not working is plainly evidenced by the success of the Communist Party in resisting attack. That much-abused movement, never large enough to justify the hysteria against it, today enjoys a greater degree of liberty in conducting its propaganda than in all its years of activity. Laws aimed against it are either not enforced or have been crippled by the courts. Its spokesmen have access to the radio; its newspapers go freely through the mails; its meetings are almost everywhere open and unhindered.

Against this more hopeful picture of advances in tolerance to labor and the left are to be pitted the issues of control of the great means of communication by which public opinion is made—the radio, motion pictures and the press. Three great radio chains, five great motion picture producing companies, and three press agencies control what the country hears, sees, and reads. Some relief from this monopoly of opinion can be achieved by compelling the radio companies to treat controversial issues equally on the air, as they are now forced by law to treat political candidates. Radio stations can be required, in return for a free franchise, to set aside definite and desirable times for the presentation of public issues. Motion pictures can be freed of the narrow and intolerant censorship, in seven states, which prescribes the standards of political and sex morality. The power of those state censors can be removed by repealing the laws, and leaving the control of obscenity, as in other states, to criminal prosecution. Censorship of the press, accomplished chiefly by exclusion from the mails for "sedition" or "obscenity," can be abolished by taking away from the single solicitor of the Post Office Department a power which should be exercised only by the judgment of juries. Such a system has worked with universal satisfaction for six years in the Customs Bureau to determine the exclusion of matter from abroad.

While these are the dominant issues of civil liberties today, hardly less important to defenders of civil rights are the freedom of teaching from the effects of compulsory loyalty oath laws for teachers, intended to impose conformity to the status quo on the whole profession; the issues of religious liberty involved in the expulsion of over two hundred children of the Jehovah's Witnesses from the schools for refusing on conscientious grounds to salute the flag; the host of discriminations by law and practice against Negroes in the exercise of civil rights; the exclusion and deportation of aliens solely because of their political or economic views; and the rights of the neglected native minorities in our colonies.

Democracy can be saved against the forces which throughout the country would sacrifice it to Fascism only by the incessant labors of all who cherish peaceful progress. The rights of none are safe if the rights of

any are attacked. No issue is too obscure. Democracy is undermined, not all at once but little by little. It is only as all of us, whatever our connections, use our power of resistance that we can maintain these vital processes of change towards social justice, inherent in democratic liberty.

The Way of a Pacifist

PAUL JONES

Those who are pacifists merely between wars are similar to those who are prohibitionists between drinks, in that both are unconvincing representatives of their professed faith. But they are not necessarily dishonest. I should like to underline that statement, for there is often as much misunderstanding about pacifists by those who follow the war method as there has been misunderstanding of what constitutes peace by many calling themselves pacifists.

Every immediate threat of war, whether international or industrial, brings to the front a group of people who had thought they were pacifists, but who, because of their strong sympathy for one special side in the impending conflict, find it necessary to revise their attitude. A little over a year ago, when the Spanish civil war began, such a phenomenon could be observed; and even such a person as Fenner Brockway, head of the War Resisters International, who had been a pacifist during the world war, found it necessary at that time to resign from his position because pacifism no longer seemed to him adequate to meet the situation; he was more concerned with the fate of the Spanish loyalists. In the present struggle between Japan and China the same thing has been evident again. Editorial writers and news commentators have been at pains to point out how inadequate and carelessly drawn is our Neutrality Act, for if put into operation it would interfere with legitimate American business and might even injure our friend China more than Japan. The Neutrality Act is not pacifism, although it was intended to help keep us out of war; but because it has been supported by pacifists, it is generally regarded as in that category. The writers, however, overlook the fact that the Act was not intended either to aid our friends or punish our enemies, but its purpose was definitely to restrict American business so that abnormal war demands and opportunities would not so deeply involve us that we would be drawn into the conflict. Sympathy for a group such as American business men, or a cause such as that of China, has in the case of these writers proved stronger than any interest they may have had in preventing war.

The point of all this is that pacifism is not, never has been, and cannot be a short and easy way of getting protection or an advantage for your own group or a group in which you are interested. People who honestly have not liked the war method, and have consequently embraced pacifism, have over and over again become disillusioned about the latter when it has threatened to cost them or their side or their friends something. They have not realized that pacifism grows out of a different set of values—that it is concerned with human welfare, rather than that of a group, class, race, or nation; that its approach to other individuals or groups is always the *moral* one, rather than the threat of power. But it will be noted that it requires a person of more than average sympathy to think in terms larger than those of his group, and it demands more than average stamina to raise the struggle from the plane of crude physical power to that of moral force. Pacifism is not a method for morons.

The individual who embraces pacifism of the thorough-going type is usually known as a conscientious objector because of his strong scruples against war, although the basic reasons motivating such individuals may be of considerable variety, from the Old Testament prohibition of killing or the New Testament positive admonition of love, to plain humanitarian, utilitarian, or psychological considerations. In spite of that variety, however, there is an essential unity involving most of the group that can be described as commitment to a theory of human relationships and human values, which leaves no place for the use of the war method. It is not so much that pacifists are *against* war as that they are *for* the method of good will, sacrifice, and love; and when one is following that way to the limit, because he believes that human nature will ultimately respond in coöperative terms to that approach, it is out of the question for him to use the ways of threat and coercion.

It is no wonder that the pacifist becomes somewhat weary of the oft-repeated question—would you do nothing if your wife were assaulted, if Japan should attack this country, etc.? The question betrays such an ignorance of the pacifist point of view that one is inclined to doubt whether there is in the asker any desire to understand it. The pacifist, far from doing nothing, would endeavor to use some intelligence in his approach to the situation, removing, if possible, the occasion or cause for the attack, and making his appeal to something other than the fears of the attacker.

War has never corrected any injustices except by the imposition of many more injustices; it has never protected any individual or group except at the expense of the safety of countless others. The pacifist is committed to ways of meeting such situations which, while not without risk and danger, do contain the possibility of bringing an end to the injustices in question.

The basis for this position rests on the fact that there is some spark of decency in every human being, and that no group, whether gang or nation, is entirely devoid of ordinary human traits. The aim of the pacifist is to draw upon those things rather than to drive them underground by the use of violence, whether individual or national. People tend to respond to the way in which they are approached, and, while the response may often be delayed, good will, love, and suffering are rather apt to win in the end. War simply cannot win—for anything that is worth while.

It is not surprising that a number of the churches are asking the government to grant exemption from combatant service to such of their members as have committed themselves wholly to this way of peace. It may even be that, if the number of such people can be increased, governments will find it possible to abandon some of their belligerent ways and venture into fields of reconciliation.

The Effort to Stamp Out Syphilis in This Country

ARTHUR WILLIAM STILLIANS

There are two main divisions in the management of disease: prevention and cure. The first belongs chiefly to the Health Department. The second is the business of the private physician. The Health Department tries to prevent typhoid germs from getting into our drinking water, to keep mad dogs off the street, to lessen the amount of smoke and other dirt that we must breathe, to protect us in a hundred ways. The physician stands ready to treat us in case the efforts of the Health Department fail to protect us, or in case we are stricken with heart disease, for instance, from which the Health Department cannot protect us.

In relation to syphilis, the case is somewhat different. Cure is prevention. The first effect of proper treatment of a case of early syphilis is to render it non-infectious, to remove the germs from the moist surfaces where they lurk ready to pass to another by contact or to lodge on the drinking cup or spoon from which another may obtain them. The Health Department, to be sure, has inspected all food handlers and has given instructions for the proper washing of eating utensils; but with the best of care such rules are open to errors in operation. Stopping the supply of spirochetes, the germs that cause syphilis, at the source is a far better way of preventing syphilis. This is done by the private physician.

First, however, the syphilitic must be made aware of his infection, or he will not subject himself to treatment. Does he not know that he has syphilis? Not always, by any means. A young girl went to the aid of her mother who had a cinder in her eye. According to time-honored custom in certain parts of the world, the girl put her tongue into her mother's eye and removed the irritating body, little thinking that she was infecting her mother with syphilis. The mucous patches on her tongue were painless, she had not happened to notice them, and she thought herself entirely well. About three weeks later the mother noticed a pimple on her eyelid, slowly enlarging and becoming hard, which the doctor said was a chancre, the sore that initiates syphilis. The mother was in the first stage of the disease, the daughter in the second. Fortunately, prompt treatment saved them both from serious consequences. The mother's infection was not wholly without compensating benefit. By means of it, the daughter was warned of the need of treatment, and no doubt saved from infecting others and saved as well from the danger of long continued neglect of her disease and the development of the serious, sometimes fatal, late results. It is not uncommon for those who have early, infectious syphilis to be wholly unaware of the fact, and they often spread the disease right and left like the carrier of typhoid or diphtheria.

If all those with early syphilis were aware of the fact and would take proper and adequate treatment, the disease would soon become extinct, instead of being, as it is, one of the commonest of diseases. Preventing its extinction is not only the fact of its hidden presence but also the fear that the doctor may unwittingly disclose the fact of the patient's disgraceful disease, or that he will report the case by name to the Health Department or to the employer. All these, as well as the lack of money, may argue for delay. The sore is not painful and heals after a time, the secondary stage may be overlooked as it was in the example cited, and the patient hopes that his fear was groundless, and soon forgets the incident. If he goes to the doctor and takes treatment, he may conclude, when the treatment has done away with his symptoms, as it promptly does, that he is safe. He may therefore disregard the warning of his doctor that treatment, to be successful, must be continued a long time. Syphilis is a most deceitful disease. It may remain hidden for ten, twenty, even fifty years, all the time gradually gaining a hold on vital organs without producing symptoms. Such cases must be discovered by means of the blood examination.

Under the able leadership of Surgeon General Parran, a campaign is now being waged with the following objectives:

1. To discover the hidden cases of syphilis.
2. To provide adequate treatment for them.
3. To teach the syphilitics the proper conduct of their lives.
4. To teach the public at large the sensible view of the disease and the wise attitude toward those afflicted with it.
5. To gather statistics of the prevalence of syphilis, that we may have a basis for the estimation of the success or failure of our efforts.

Thanks to the already changed attitude of the newspapers and magazines and many societies, the public is eager for information and willing to coöperate —if it does not cost too much effort. Ignorance can be overcome in time; but it will take years to reach the class of people most liable to syphilitic infection. This campaign is a long lived one. We do not expect success at once. We hope in years to come to parallel the wonderful results obtained in Sweden and Denmark. Instead of 328 new cases of syphilis each year per 100,000 white inhabitants, as we have, Denmark has only 20 new infections each year and Sweden only 7 each year per 100,000.* This triumph is the outcome of years of wise, energetic, yet patient endeavor, unremitting in its vigilance.

One of the first aims of our educational campaign is to impress upon the patient that his right to secrecy will be respected just as long as he keeps his promise to follow directions and persist in treatment. Only those who break the rules are reported by name. Employers, too, are taught that it is against public policy for them to discharge employes because of syphilis. They should be retained whenever possible and helped to get good treatment. If discharged, it often happens that they cannot get treatment and remain a menace to the public.

A recent new line of attack on the problem of the prevalence of syphilis in this country is the questionnaire sent out recently in Chicago asking the citizen to signify his willingness to have a blood test taken, without identification, except to the doctor who takes the specimen, and without expense. The response has been greater than hoped for, and if it is followed by tests will furnish valuable information as to the prevalence of syphilis; and will undoubtedly uncover a number of wholly unsuspected cases.

**Shadow on the Land.* By T. Parran, New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, Page 109.

While we cannot as yet cite figures in support of our impression, many of those who are in contact with prenatal syphilis feel that the number of cases occurring in this country has already decreased. The success with this form of the disease has been marked in Scandinavia. The discovery and treatment of syphilis in the mother before the fourth month of pregnancy protect the child completely. Even after this time, treatment of the mother often saves the baby. No matter how long ago the mother's syphilis occurred, or how much treatment she has had in the past, she should always take more treatment during her pregnancy, for there may still be danger for the child. Here also a great deal of inertia and ignorance must be overcome. Their mothers brought them into the world and raised large families without any such foolish precautions. Why should they take the trouble to go to a clinic or engage an obstetrician early in pregnancy? One of the best ways in which the members of the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice and other religious liberals can help in the fight against syphilis is for the women to organize a movement to teach all expectant mothers that it is to their benefit and to the benefit of their future children to put themselves under the care of an obstetrician in the early stage of pregnancy. By such care syphilis can be prevented. The slight extra effort put forth by each one will save danger, pain, and expense for some, even though the majority are found free of disease.

Courses of study can be planned, using books like *Syphilis as a Modern Problem,* by W. A. Pusey, published by the American Medical Association, Chicago, in 1915; *The Third Great Plague,* by J. A. Stokes, W. B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia and London, 1917; or the most recent one by Dr. Parran, to which I have already referred.

If the local Health Department seems to be slow in joining the campaign, an investigation can be made to find out whether the seeming reluctance is due to lack of interest or lack of funds, and the members of the Fellowship can set about to supply the lack, whatever it may be. Personal and concerted participation in the campaign and the use of any opportunity to urge others to do likewise are the privilege of all of us.

The financial argument is strongly in favor of the campaign. There is no doubt that for every dollar spent in eliminating syphilis, many dollars now spent annually for the care of syphilitic cripples and insane will be saved. Though a minor consideration, this is the argument that has the greatest appeal to some. Far outweighing this, however, is the saving of pain in both body and mind.

Trumpets on New Horizons

Fashionable Church

When church bells chime their Sunday call
Fine cars outline the street,
As worshipers in costly furs
Enter on well shod feet.

Choir boys chant the sacred songs
With voices trained and true.
With fragrant censers swinging low,
They pass each cushioned pew.

Lo! who is this Stranger shadowed there;
This One with nail pierced feet?
The congregation pass Him by
Where the city's fashion meet.

MARY WARD.

Factory Girl

(To D. M.)

This is life's symphony for her,
The whir of wheels, the ceaseless noise;
Upon the floor the checkered blur
Is all the sun that she enjoys.

Her romance is a rotten stair
Which daily she will climb, descend;
Her dreams of love—so sweet and fair—
Are grist for greed's malignant end.

She's married to a cold machine
Which drains her body, blood and bone;
And she is dead at seventeen—
The mill has turned her heart to stone.

VINCENT BURNS.

The Dance Upon Nothing

Riptides of passion surge with riot force,
And sluice-gates of the soul are hurtled wide;
The weirs of wisdom centuries have guyed
Are flotsam in its wildly rampant course.
Creation's lords revert to beastlike source
And stalk the jungle, grim and jackal-eyed,
Seething with bloodthirst, direly satisfied,
When Negro quarry hangs—a dangling corpse!

And what a pageant for the gaping mob
Whose eyes, aflare with hatred, light the gloom
With feline gleam as tautened ligature
Wrings from his throat one spirit-curdling sob!
(Blind eyes that cannot vision in his doom
Stark Calvary in weird caricature.)

GORDON LECLAIRE.

"Let There Be Light"

Need we have another flood of tears?
Need we bear our sons for flag-draped biers?
Horrible the Stars and Stripes appears
Feeble atonement for a life. It jeers
Each star a vacant eye that's blind to truth,
Each stripe a finger pointing to a youth
Ensnared unwillingly on a war-dog's tooth,
Fantastic trimming for a dead-man's booth.
First was there need for light when worlds began
To bring full-circle the Creator's plan.
You who have ears, listen if you can:
"Let there be light" NOW in the heart of man.

V. FRIEDERIKA VAN BUSKIRK.

Education for Democracy and the Good Life

WALTER A. ANDERSON

Religious and educational workers are faced with a common task—that of educating for democracy as a way of life. Social progress, democracy, and the good life are closely related; likewise static social conditions, Fascism, and human exploitation are related. Our common task lies with the first three. Through democratic procedures social progress seems assured, and the good life for all has promise of attainment. Forces of reaction and social degradation stand in our paths, Fascism threatens to wipe out democracy, and evidences of human exploitation challenge us to united action. Together we must be concerned with the great educational problems of the day; coöperatively we must work for their solution.

This article attempts briefly to present some of the arguments for united action in each of five areas. To treat them adequately should be the purpose of a series of articles by qualified investigators in each field.

Federal financial support is imperative.

One does not have to examine deeply the ability of communities and states to pay for education to realize the need for financial support from the Federal government. Especially is this true if there is to be anything approaching equalization of educational opportunity for children and adults. Exhaustive studies have shown that some states are financially unable to support an adequate educational program even if the entire tax return were utilized. Other states, because of their rich resources, are able to support an adequate program and to contribute to less fortunate states.

To date, Federal support legislation has not been passed except in certain specialized areas of education, despite insistent demands from educational and lay groups. The need is for continued effort to inform citizens of educational conditions and thereby to mold an enlightened public opinion for such support. Of primary importance, such legislation should provide assistance where it is needed rather than the indiscriminate subsidizing of educational activities where communities are able to pay. Also it is important that financial support be provided without Federal control over state and local educational policies. In a democracy, decisions as to use of funds should remain with the state and local communities.

The school curriculum must be reconstructed.

An enlightened educational philosophy, based on cumulative studies of social conditions and the process of human growth and development, implies far-reaching changes at all levels in the school curriculum. Significant beginnings of reconstruction have been made in the elementary school, the secondary school is challenged to re-think its program, the college is feeling the impact of a dynamic educational philosophy. The essence of this philosophy is respect for personality, faith in people, and belief in the desirability of growth and change.

Important among the studies now available are those which help to explain the learning process in terms of the continuous development of the individual in a social setting. This learning theory rejects sterile school procedures based on faculty psychology and the doctrine of formal discipline. It also rejects the mechanical S-R bond explanation of learning which has been the basis for much of our so-called scientific education. An organic viewpoint as opposed to a mechanistic viewpoint is permeating our educational thought.

The organic viewpoint emphasizes the whole environment as the source of learning. To the extent the environment is challenging, the learning will be effective; be it good or bad. This viewpoint sees learning as a unitary process which includes real challenges, careful planning on the part of the learner, vital experiences in carrying out the plan, and, finally, reflective thinking on what has been accomplished. It emphasizes community service as the source of most effective learning. It accepts the premise that education which deals with real life problems is the best preparation for later life.

In most of our schools today the program is based on a sterile academic concept of education. It is schooling in books, not education, which is so ardently supported. If we would have effective education, we must bring the schools into close relation with community life. Youth must have opportunities to participate with adults in worthwhile activities. Desirable social goals give driving purpose to education. The curriculum must become vital and challenging. It must contribute to the release of potentialities for the good life in individuals and the development of intelligent leadership for social progress.

One who is scholarly in his search for truth and conscious of the social obligation of the school cannot fail to give assistance and support to the groups of teachers and laymen who are endeavoring to re-think education and to reconstruct the curriculum in terms of an enlightened educational and social philosophy. The supreme purpose of the school has been stated by a great national commission as "the creation of rich and many sided personalities equipped with practical knowledge and inspired by ideals so they can make their way and fulfill their mission in a changing society."

Democratic schools should educate for democracy.

Closely related to curriculum reconstruction is the problem of procedure in school administration and teaching. It is common knowledge that current patterns of management were borrowed from foreign lands, from industry, and from the military. They are based on an authoritarian concept of human relations and a mechanistic concept of the learning process. As such, they are in conflict with the philosophy which seeks democracy as a way of life, and which seeks unique and creative growth for every learner and every teacher.

There is reason to believe that schools which are autocratically administered and taught produce sheep-like followers who are docile in the hands of dominating leaders. A citizenry is developed which is open to exploitation and fascist regimentation. Only as the learner lives in a school which respects personality, only as he has a chance to practice democracy will he learn the responsibilities of a citizen in a democracy. As he has experiences in solving problems, he learns the procedures for effective problem-solving. Likewise, as he ex-

periences democracy as a way of life, he will be better able and more willing to place his faith in coöperative effort for the common good. Teachers, laymen, and pupils must have opportunities to participate democratically in educational planning.

Academic freedom is essential in a democracy.

If cultural change demands curriculum reconstruction, if our citizens should be enlightened on social and economic conditions, if democratic principles should operate in government and in teaching, if the forces of reaction are to be successfully combatted—then academic freedom must be defended. On every hand one views curtailment of the freedom of the teachers in the name of patriotism and 100 per cent Americanism. Vested interests within and without the school dictate much of the content of the curriculum; teachers' oath laws humiliate the profession, children are exploited; democracy is given only lip service. School workers are hemmed in on all sides by tradition, ignorance, and greed. As a result, schools are in danger of becoming sterile in the realm of democracy and the good life.

Freedom to present truth, to examine controversial issues, to experiment with promising procedures, to bare the facts of social and economic conditions, to be critical of static institutions is essential to education in a democracy. Enlightened forces must coöperate to defend freedom of press, speech, and assembly that our citizenry is not denied its birthright. We may well keep in mind the statement of a prominent educator: "Democracy challenges man to create a better civilization and demands that to this end his creative powers be free."

Teacher organizations should defend professional and democratic ideals.

In order that academic freedom may be retained and schools may teach democracy as a way of life teachers should have the inspiration, security, and professional effectiveness that come from organization. They need to work with others in their profession and in the community who share common ideals. They need to belong to a group in the community representing many occupations but a common goal. This group may be independent or it may be affiliated with a nation-wide movement. What is essential is that teachers, with others from various occupations who have common creative objectives, join forces to study the needs of the community and to determine appropriate lines of action. Such opportunity to affiliate with other workers is denied a large number of our teachers. Only at the risk of their positions may they do so. Certain affiliations are legitimate, while others are taboo.

As the teaching profession, together with other creative forces, proceeds in its attack on the problems which stand in the way of democracy and the good life, the values of organization with others of similar aspirations take on added significance. It is essential that these organizations be founded on democratic principles and that they be democratically administered. Their programs promise to be effective in the lives of larger numbers in proportion to the extent they are so managed.

In conclusion, it is probably true that the educational forces of the country cannot be socially effective in the protection and advancement of free education unless they are able to present an organized front against the opposition of vested interests.

Voluntary Parenthood

BERNARD FANTUS

The term *birth control* has largely become synonymous with prevenception, and eugenics has come to mean prohibiting the birth of the unfit. And yet, the best interests of the human race demand that birth control should also include a positive side, i. e., the encouraging of the propagation of the best; and that eugenics should also include a positive, a constructive side, and aim at the preserving by offspring of the highest type of humanity quite as much as the preventing of the birth of the worst.

It is unfortunate that the "progressive" has come to champion and practise the limitation of offspring largely perhaps because it is opposed by the so-called "conservative." The intelligentsia is largely engaged in a process of self-extermination, while the "ignorantia" breed prolifically. True, the death rate among the latter is high; among the former, low. But there can be no doubt that the statistically proved seven-tenths of an offspring of the Harvard graduate is incompetent to maintain its stock. One thing is certain: they who practise negative birth control thereby declare themselves unfit to propagate, at least to the extent and for the time they practise it. Of course, all those who employ prevenception believe in their hearts that the time will come when they can permit themselves the luxury of children. But, by the time the oriental rugs cover the floor and oil paintings the wall, fertility in many cases has waned, never to return.

There are other racial dangers lurking in birth control methods now employed. Dangerous to the health of a possible offspring is the use of chemic prevenceptives capable of destroying the vitality of the sperm. It has been shown by experiments upon rapidly breeding lower forms of life that it is possible to so damage the sperm that it may still fertilize the ovum but give birth to deformed, diseased, or sterile offspring. The possibility of such occurrence in human mating must be admitted. Its proof would come too late to be of value to the present generation.

Birth control, as practised at present, must not only be charged with being antagonistic to the best interests of the human race; but it also not infrequently, when practised unhygienically, interferes with the enjoyment of the sex life of the woman. When the woman suffers from sexual dissatisfaction, she naturally will be reluctant to grant sexual privileges to the husband or will refuse them altogether; and these reactions are among the greatest causes of domestic infelicity.

All this arraignment of negative and unhygienic birth control does not mean that voluntary control of parenthood is not desirable. It does mean, however, that it should be employed with proper discrimination and means, and in the proper circles. The destitute, the very ones most in need of it, are the ones to whom birth control information is least accessible. Even the

more hygienic methods of prevention are not absolutely sure preventives of conception; and it is probably well, for moral as well as racial reasons, that they are not. More positive means of sterilization are in the hands of the medical profession. And it is hoped that the time will come when the art of the physician will have developed to the extent of its not only being capable of preserving the health of the individual, but also will have become competent enough to act as the protector of the health and the welfare of the human race even before the conception.

Theology and the law have quite properly declared themselves guardians of the marriage bed. Theology sees to it, so far as it can, that only those with similar religious belief unite in marriage. This eliminates at least one ill wind from the stormy sea of matrimony. The law makes marriage a financial transaction; and, of course, the more soundly endowed with physical means the more secure the union and the better the chances for a successful career for the offspring. Our civilization still has to learn—and it is learning—that medicine needs to become a third guardian. It can even now prevent venereal disease contamination of the union. It can even now teach hygienic methods of prevenception. It can now preach the gospel of voluntary parenthood to those who should become parents, and point to the danger of postponing its possibility until it may be too late. And in time it may develop into a wise and safe counselor against parenthood for those who, for social, racial, or individual reasons, should not propagate, and fit them with suitable means to this end.

American Labor Organizes

HAROLD P. MARLEY

Back of all the sensational and melodramatic, the fact which stands out from the industrial scene today is the rise of the organization movement. Not only are more workers paying dues into a Union treasury today, but those who carry *cards* are to be found in the lower brackets of skill and among the white collar groups as well. If the depression produced a New Deal, the new status of the worker under this Deal surely brought forth a new sense of solidarity between the forgotten man and the unemployed technician. Without knowing it and without planning it, American philosophy gradually changed as the wolf stretched himself on our doorstep.

The organization era is a natural outcome of the prosperity days with their chamber of commerce ethic. Towns once thought in terms of factory chimneys rather than labor halls and held out as a bait the fact that the labor market was docile and 100 per cent American. It was inevitable that eventually the worker would rise to protect his rights, which the Chamber of Commerce had bartered away. It also followed that the favored A. F. of L. craft unions which had made peace with the building and business interests would stand in the way of anything that appeared to lower the standards and throw the equilibrium out of kilter.

The present bitter antagonism between the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. is not the personal quarrel of two labor leaders, but it is the outgrowth of many years of struggle between the craft idea and the industrial idea in unionism. Early in the century the conflict was getting under way between Samuel Gompers and the I. W. W. Resolutely, William Green upheld the Gompers tradition, but at San Francisco, in 1934, the pressure of industrial organization groups was so strong that the delegates admitted that "a new condition exists, requiring organization upon a different basis to be most effective." They mentioned automobiles specifically and within the year granted a charter to the automobile workers convention meeting in Detroit. It was an insincere gesture, for Mr. Green appointed his own president and served notice that metal crafts would be excluded. At the following A. F. of L. convention in Atlantic City, which listened to the negative reports on the steel and auto industries, the issue was forced by John L. Lewis. Although the industrial union group lost by several thousand votes, the heavy-eyebrowed leader pointed out that nearly 40 per cent of the A. F. of L. membership supported his recommendation. He commented, "the progressive ranks will grow during the next few years. How long this fight will last, no one knows . . . there can be no retreat."

Since this prediction was uttered, the C. I. O., building on vertical unions, such as the United Mine Workers, and others, has surpassed the two million members of the A. F. of L. The phenomenal growth is not due to the dynamic qualities of Mr. Lewis and his helpers, but to the nature of the needs of the worker. The winter of 1936-37 will not be remembered alone for the pick-up in industry and enlarging profits to stockholders, but also for the rapid organization of workers and their collective bargaining contracts with management under the Federal law. Rubber, glass, automobile, steel, and electrical workers all got signed agreements which embraced a half million people. Where employers such as Henry Ford or the Harlan Coal operators proved overly recalcitrant, they found themselves in the toils of an investigation of the National Labor Relations Board.

There is a basic difference in philosophy between these two major forces of labor today as real as that which caused the Unitarians to split away from the Congregationalists a hundred years ago. At that time the courts gave church property to those who held the majority viewpoint in the theological debate. That the courts will some day hand over the coveted cash reserves and Florida rest homes to the C. I. O. is not so likely. Already the A. F. of L. is making adjustments to get its share of the influx, even to the point of flirting with *company* unions. It has lost certain unions such as the furriers, and the American Federation of Teachers at Madison a few weeks ago held out a definite threat that the A. F. of L. would have to be liberalized or they would withdraw.

This fall, the craft union convention will have to decide whether the C. I. O. groups, now under suspension, will be definitely dismissed.* With men like John Frey of the Metal trades, venting his bitterness, there is little hope of a peaceful outcome. In the meantime, it is significant to observe the attitude of business and policy forming groups who are seeking to influence public opinion. Almost overnight, the editorial writers

*At Denver, Oct. 11, a resolution was adopted authorizing the Executive Council to proceed to expel one or all C. I. O. unions.—EDITORS.

have discovered that a man named Green is not such a bad fellow. He is given a halo, and the advice to workers who must join a union is to tie up with the A. F. of L. Churches are not overlooked as a power of swaying public opinion, and so someone is responsible for seeing that here and there a clergyman is drafted into service. One minister at Johnstown, Penn., who began in a small way by serving on a "back to work" movement, is now head of a national association which would spread the vigilante principles into a kind of universal technique. The activities of the original citizens' committee in Johnstown were so sinister, however, that a rabbi resigned, and the National Labor Relations Board later instituted an investigation. Another minister is publishing from the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C., *America Forward,* which is a "journal of Patriotic Religious Education" going free to any minister who will send the editors a postal card. This journal makes a play at fairness to the worker—the A. F. of L. worker—and extols his leader, "William Green—American." In the Labor Day issue which went to a hundred thousand clergymen of all faiths in every state in the Union, Jesus, the carpenter, is exalted and the N. L. R. B. is upbraided. About the only definite platform announced in this issue is a demand for a 20 per cent increase in minister's salaries, but a knowledge of the America Forward Movement would indicate that it is the spiritual counterpart of a larger crystallization against the C. I. O. Its new Bible costs $6.50, is published by a Wall street company and is called *How to Deal with Organized Labor.* The "Bible" has all the proof texts necessary to furnish one with "the facts you need in order to safeguard your profits and at the same time avoid costly labor disturbances."

The immediate reason for the concerted drive against "radical" tendencies in labor is not the fear of additional sit-down strikes, but the political threat. The doctrine of ballots, not bullets, has been seriously taken to heart by the C. I. O., and in cities like Akron and Detroit there are indications that workers and their wives may vote into office their own candidates. This, the A. F. of L., with its game of playing Democrat against Republican, never did. There may be undesirable features in a municipal labor administration, but the only cure is to offer the voter names of men who are eminently fair. If this is not done, the same results which occurred in the national election of last November will be repeated in state and city politics. Politically speaking, the middle class may be eliminated. Furthermore, the professional groups are discovering that in matters of civil rights, industrial democracy and job security they have a great deal in common with the worker. The breach is further constricted by the move of the new unions to set up machinery of education and recreation. Not only do defunct bank buildings make excellent places to have union offices and receive the dollar-a-month dues, but bankrupt lodge halls are becoming places for athletic tournaments, socials, and classes in labor education. There are newspapers in places where organization has taken root, and a research department carries on studies which find their way into pamphlets.

How this rising organization movement is to be received is an important question. If churches, newspapers, and existing organizations become antagonistic, or even maintain a strict neutrality, the organized labor movement will suffer but not die. There is no indication that the two major factions will destroy each other. Under our present economic system, organization must be regarded as a necessary step of the worker to secure his right. That it is not the final solution is equally certain. The age-long struggle between capital and labor for the division of spoils cannot go on forever. Labor, now on a parity with the employer as to power, has no intention of eliminating its traditional antagonist. Out of the equilibrium that follows the era of confusion which we now have will come a new theory of ownership and production which will undercut many of the evils resulting from the profit-wage idea. It will short-circuit the valiant efforts of a government, with its trend toward bureaucracy, to guarantee all kinds of social security for all kinds of people. The new system must reduce living to its spiritual essence, so that a community, in producing a given commodity, is by that very process engaging in a vital, life-giving effort.

As to ideology, the labor unions have a long way to go, which in itself ought to be a challenge to liberal religion to gear its humanitarian traditions into the necessities of this hour. When humanity marches, there is no need for equivocation.

In Springfield Station

The work train has come in,
And the toil-stained workers come
Marching in ranks of denim rags,
A motley crew of black-faced, tired saints . . .

O I have seen soldiers on the fields of France,
Erect and rhythmic with that martial tread
That hums to drums and white-starred banners,
But never have I seen a file like this:
The wounded of the labor front:
The stunted, twisted backs, the lagging gait,
The broken hands, the tortured faces,
The terrible hopelessness, beyond all tears,
The dreaming quenched, all higher hopes destroyed
By what uncounted days of beast-like labor . . .

O I could kneel and worship here,
This Negro bent beneath his load of kindling wood
Dug from the dumps for some poor hovel's fire;
This hump-backed workman, hand in hand
With his two little ones, so gaily come to greet him;
These two scarred, grizzly vets of railroad wars,
Swapping their obscene talk and ambling on;
This lame lad, dragging a withered limb,
Lunch-pail on his arm and face as old as Time;
This hulking brute, all dirt and soot,
With jet black hair and heavy boots
That beat an ominous note upon the station-floor;
These are the marred sons of the Adam-race
Made less than men
By all the brutal blindness of the social scheme . . .

How long, O Lord, how long? . . .

O I could kneel and worship here,
Where these pathetic heroes shuffle by,
Upon their backs the cross of labor
And where they tread—*most holy ground* . . .

VINCENT BURNS.

Peace Tactics for the Present Crisis

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE

Will the United States join the war in the Far East? Not this year. Probably not next year. After that it is possible. It is not inevitable that we should go in, and to stay out would be of immense advantage not only to ourselves, but also to China and the whole world. Yet whether we shall manage to keep out of war embroilment in the next few years depends to an alarming extent on day-to-day choices and formulation of policies which the Government is making *now*. Now is the crucial time to strive for the early steps which lead away from war and take the road to peace.

Looking back on some steps which led us into our last two wars, it may be salutary to remember that President McKinley took office desiring to avert war with Spain, but in April, 1897, he appointed Theodore Roosevelt Assistant Secretary of the Navy although he was warned of Roosevelt's warlike propensities. Roosevelt in a few months pushed the appointment of Commodore Dewey for command of the Asiatic fleet in preparation for a possible attack on Manila. The appointment was made October 21, 1897, six months before we declared war against Spain and after Mr. Roosevelt had presented to the President a memorandum which expressed the belief that we "should blockade, and if possible, take Manila." Thus, yielding to the proposals of an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, the United States was started on a course of entanglement in the Far East of whose consequences we cannot see the end, even forty years later.

McKinley was not intending war when he sent the battleship *Maine* to Havana harbor. He only meant to protect the American citizens there. After the sailing orders were issued, our Consul General in Havana wired to Washington urging postponement of the *Maine's* visit. On the day that the *Maine* arrived he hourly reported to the State Department to say that as yet no hostile demonstration had occurred. But three weeks later, when the *Maine* was blown to bits and 260 men and officers perished with her, of what avail were McKinley's peaceful intentions?

Woodrow Wilson, at the beginning of the Great War counselled neutrality, and more than a year after its beginning declared that two things were "plain" to him:

> "(1) The people of this country count on me to keep them out of war;
>
> "(2) It would be a calamity to the world at large if we should be drawn actively into the conflict and so deprived of all disinterested influence over the settlement."

Yet the die began to be cast for our going to war on October 23, 1914, when the President was persuaded to begin weakening Mr. Bryan's prohibition of August, 1914, against credits and war loans to belligerent governments. And as early as February, 1915, President Wilson set the course which we can now see took us straight into the war, in the notes which he wrote to Germany and England, following Germany's first announcement that she would use the submarine weapon. To Germany he said:

> "The Government of the United States would be constrained to hold the Imperial Government of Germany to a strict accountability for such acts of their naval authorities, and to take any steps it might be necessary to take to safeguard American lives and property and to secure to American citizens the full enjoyment of their acknowledged rights on the high seas."

To the British Government, which had authorized British vessels to fly the American flag when they traversed the submarine zone, the President's remonstrance was much less strict. He distinguished between the "occasional use of the flag of a neutral"—which apparently he was ready to allow—and "any general use of the flag of the United States by British vessels." "This," he said, "the Government of the United States would view with anxious solicitude."

It is an interesting coincidence that the specific instance cited in this note for Great Britain's attention was the report "that the Captain of the *Lusitania,* acting upon orders or information received from the British authorities, raised the American flag as his vessel approached the British coasts." This note was sent on February 10, 1915—almost three months before a German torpedo struck the *Lusitania!*

If the people of the United States want to stay out of war and if it be possible for them to learn anything from experience, they ought to appreciate the extreme importance of formulating and adopting in the earliest stages of any war, a clear and consistent national policy designed to keep the country out. Without such a policy publicly announced and scrupulously adhered to, we shall be at the mercy of circumstances, of chance decisions by the President and even by subordinate officials in the Government Departments. The United States is in exactly such a perilous position today. The *New York Herald Tribune* in a recent editorial was right when it called upon the President "not for a stronger, but a surer hand in control." It stated:

> "There is an unsatisfactory incoherence about a diplomacy under which Ambassador Johnson announces that he is evacuating Nanking under orders at the moment that Admiral Yarnell is pointedly advising the Japanese that our ships will remain to protect the Ambassador; under which the President makes statements interpreted in one sense and the State Department 'explains' them in another; under which the Neutrality Act is halfway invoked for one category of ships and left uninvoked for others."

What then would be the right policy and tactics for the United States to adopt at this juncture? Broadly speaking, I believe it should be based on two related but not identical aims: (1) To abstain from war, and (2) to promote peace. Owing to limits of space I can only sketch in briefest outline, and limited argument, some of the vital steps which the above policies would seem to call for.

The fact that Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden kept out of the Great War should silence the parrot-like repetition of the *cliché* that America was inevitably drawn in and would inevitably participate in another world conflict. The United States is far better situated than most countries to withstand the contagion of the war madness if we determine so to do and put our national brains and resources into this line of national defense. For this objective, peace

minded organizations and churches should press upon our Government the following steps:

(1) *Immediate invocation of the Neutrality Act.* It is not a perfect Act, but it is better than any similar law which the country has had, and it is the law. For the President to postpone further its promulgation under the fiction that there is yet no "war" in China is in all honest thinking to nullify the law of the United States. How can our State Department call upon Japan to honor her treaties when the President of our country refuses to honor the law of his own Congress?

(2) *Urgent advice to American citizens in the war area to withdraw; and the offer of financial compensation to those whose business or fortunes are seriously affected as a result of their compliance with this advice.* The Government should not compel all citizens to remove. There are some missionaries and others whose duty may clearly call them to stay in exposed positions. But if they stay it should be at their own risk. They should have no right to expect or receive United States military protection in circumstances which are bound to risk drawing our whole country into a national disaster.

(3) *Compensation to citizens and legitimate businesses within the United States whose interests are adversely affected by invocation of the Neutrality Act.* For example, it is stated that Japanese interests purchase the largest share of the cotton exports of the United States. If, then, the Government should some day decide that to protect the United States from war involvement this cotton ought not to be exported to Japan, the cotton growers in our South should receive financial compensation from our Government. If sectional or private interests are required to make a substantial sacrifice for the common good, then the country as a whole should help to carry their extra burden.

In applying the principle of compensation under points (2) and (3) there may be some who would object to its extension to munitions makers, international bankers, etc. I would consider such objections ill advised: First, because the Neutrality Act represents a radical reversal of former national policy to which they could not be expected to readjust their businesses over night. Secondly, because, like Lincoln's proposal just before the Civil War to compensate the slave owners of the South, the costs of such compensation in the long run are almost certain to be less than the costs of implacable hostility and greatly increased risks of war.

(4) *Recall of United States marines from China and naval vessels from the zones of war.* An early date should be set as the time after which they will not be available to take away Americans who delay longer in departing from belligerent shores.

(5) *Complete and final refusal to collaborate in any collective threats or attempts to exercise military or other coercion against Japan or any "aggressor" nation.* So long as nations maintain that they are "sovereign," every nation which is threatened by coercion from outside is liable to hit at its coercers with acts of violence which lead to war. Nobody supposes that there is only one "aggressor nation" in the world today or that England or France will risk sending any considerable portion of their armed forces from Europe to the Far East at this time. They might join the United States in making threats to Japan, but the job of making war would fall mostly to our Asiatic fleet. In this situation "collective security" is not only a fiction but a most dangerous peace illusion. In fact it would, step by step, lead to the insecurity of collective war.

(6) *Adoption of the Ludlow Amendment.* This proposal which Congressman Ludlow is trying to get before Congress would place the discretionary power of the United States to declare war in the hands of the whole body of our people. Except in the case of actual invasion, it would give them the right to vote before they fight. If a national referendum is justified on any question, why not on the momentous issue of national peace or national war? Granting that war-interested propaganda might have strong power, that power would be less dangerous if it had to be spread through all the people than it is now when it can concentrate on the narrow circle of the President, the Cabinet, and Congress.

(7) *Investigation, re-thinking, and revision of our present Army and Navy policy and procedure.* At present we have a hugely expanding bureaucratic military machine, which constantly exerts pressure on the policies and acts of the Government and demands larger and larger appropriations. It is not safeguarded by any clearly defined and democratically determined plan of national defense. According to the statements of such military veterans as the late Admiral Simms, Brigadier-General John McAuley Palmer, Major-General William C. Rivers, General Johnson Hagood, and others, we are building up a military machine to fight distant foreign wars overseas and not rationally constructed for defense of our soil at home. Major-General Smedley D. Butler pleads for an American policy in military affairs among nations which will:

> "Let the world know that we do not intend to invade them or seize their property and that our armed forces are so designed and constructed that we could not invade them even if a change of Administration should cause a change of this policy."

A thorough investigation of our military policy by a competent commission of Congress is long overdue. It ought to be started this winter.

Although the foregoing tactics may seem largely negative and unregardful of the welfare of unjustly attacked nations they would not be so if put into practice and coupled with the constructive steps for the promotion of peace which I shall next propose. Isolationist as the before mentioned strategy may appear, it is in fact the indispensable foundation for any lasting structure of peace which America, with other nations, might build. War today is spreading from land to land as a great contagion. The first requirement of nations who would fight it is to keep themselves and as much of the world as possible free from infection by war virus.

Pasteur could proceed to constructive measures for health only by first of all "negatively" refusing to coöperate with the then accepted surgical practice of using infected instruments on patients. Just so do I regard the instrument of war whether used in self defense or collectively administered against aggressor nations as a plague-infested instrument which does not purify or cure, but on the contrary spreads epidemic and suffering. War is never, like police action, a step on the road toward restraint of crime. It is the commission of more crime. It is uncontrollable virulent disease. It is economic disaster. It is hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness. It must be fought by contrary processes which tend to promote peace. Even though they cannot be expected to check every aggression or

immediately eliminate all war, they are still the best discovered means of curing the distempers which breed war and spread it. What might be some of these peace-promoting steps which the United States could take at present?

(1) *Repeal the oriental exclusion laws.* Today both Chinese and Japanese are excluded from immigration to the United States by discriminatory legislation which assigns to them a status inferior to that which we accord other nations. We should change this so as to admit them on a quota basis, the same as all the rest.

(2) *Renounce extra-territoriality privileges in China.* For years the Chinese have wished for the abolition of these infringements on their national sovereignty wrung from them by "unequal" treaties forced on China by the very nations who have signed treaties supporting her political and territorial integrity. Let the United States set an example by immediately relinquishing our claims to an outmoded special privilege.

(3) *Advance the date of Philippine Independence, accord the Islands generous economic coöperation, try to secure an international treaty safeguarding their neutrality, and withdraw our naval and military forces completely.* The force of such an example by the United States would be incalculably great in attacking the world problem of colonies and imperialism. I believe it would be one of the most far reaching and constructive influences for justice and peace that we now have power by ourselves to set in motion.

(4) *Push forward the trade-agreements program of our State Department, putting the impetus of our country behind the movement to reduce barriers to world trade.* If a comprehensive agreement could be secured with Britain soon, it might turn the tide against economic nationalism which has been one of the chief factors making for rearmament and war.

(5) *Summon a peace-without-victory world conference where the United States would lead the "have" nations in opening the doors of economic opportunity to the "have-not" countries.* Difficulties which stand in the way are enormous but not so great as the difficulty of further continuance of the present international hostility, anarchy, and threat of war. Among the outstanding problems to be tackled are finance, trade barriers, immigration, colonies, war debts, and armament. Every one of these difficulties is more susceptible of solution by brains and mutual accommodation than it is by economic strife or war. This is the way to strike at the cause of aggression. It is a necessary way of repentance consequent upon the vengeance of Versailles and other wrongs.

(6) *As we embargo wealth from the operations of war in the Orient and Spain, we should set aside a reserve with which to reconstruct the things of peace after the fighting is over.* Hospitals, educational institutions, churches, and other public buildings destroyed by bombs and fire will need rebuilding. If America aids generously they can be built better than before, like San Francisco after the fire and Tokyo after the earthquake. There will be millions of undernourished children, peasants, and workers in China, Japan, and Spain. Equally they should be fed and assisted with shelter and other necessities.

The tactics of "neutrality" conducted on lines such as the foregoing could be pushed more successfully if, as Secretary Hull recommended at Buenos Aires, the neutrality program is "undertaken jointly." Collective action between nations employing true methods of peace is clearly the road to the peace goal. It should be the policy of the United States to coöperate in all such undertakings heartily. It is only coöperation with military and coercive measures that we should eschew.

Had President Wilson held to this line and, refusing to join the Allies, appealed to all neutral countries to associate themselves with the United States in a great push for peace, it seems probable that the end of the war could have been hastened by one or more years, and a peace-without victory treaty have been negotiated in Washington that, whatever its shortcomings, would have been far better than Versailles. Had the League of Nations Covenant not contained the sanctions articles there is no doubt that the United States would have joined. Hitler has blasted away the treaty of Versailles and perhaps the League may yet cut away its coercive features and find its true life in the promotion of human betterment by international coöperation on positive lines. If that day ever comes, the United States should join. Meanwhile we can serve humanity best by isolation from the things of war, by setting an example in the ways of peace, and by humbly coöperating with whatever other nations will choose to walk with us therein.

John Haynes Holmes
Editor

UNITY

Curtis W. Reese
Managing Editor

Introducing UNITY to new readers, we offer a trial subscription of . . .

6 MONTHS for $1.00

A Journal of Free and Critical Opinion

Published semi-monthly. Regular subscription $3.00.

UNITY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago

Please enter my subscription for a trial period of six months, for which I enclose $1.00.

Name ..... Street .....

City ..... State .....

The Union Label

JOHN PAUL JONES

Should churches have their printing done in union shops and display the union label? Should ministers feel a responsibility to see that this is done? These appear to be fairly simple questions calling for an affirmative answer. The national assemblies or conferences of practically all of the Protestant denominations are on record supporting the right or even the necessity of labor organization and collective bargaining. Let us then practise what we preach.

However, matters are seldom so simple as they may seem in the abstract. Individual churches depart widely from the recommendations of their national headquarters. Business policies may be dictated in a local church by considerations other than consistency of policy or ethical caution. In my own parish the minister does not control the business. He does have considerable influence, and in some instances tips the balance of the scales. The printing is not done under the union label. Dating back a number of years prior to the present minister's pastorate, the printing has been done in a small shop where the proprietor and his wife do the work with little if any assistance. It is the kind of a shop that is fast disappearing from the city. This man once belonged to the union but he had unhappy experiences for which he is not wholly to blame. Since he does not employ helpers, he feels that it is not a matter of importance any longer. The officials of the church are not inclined to heed arguments for transferring the work from this shop to any other.

Sometimes the union label offends the artistic and esthetic sensibilities of the minister. There is one clergyman of my acquaintance, thoroughly sympathetic to labor, who will not allow the union label on his printing. He says that he is not going to have "a little bug sticking around on his stationery." Nevertheless the printing is done in a union shop and the people of his congregation are made aware of this fact and understand the reasons for it.

Is not the minister's attitude toward the union label determined entirely by his philosophy of labor in an industrial civilization? If a clergyman believes in the right and necessity of an independent, free, and autonomous organization of labor, agreeing with the words of Stanley Baldwin that "the alternative to collective bargaining is chaos," must he not use his influence wherever possible to aid labor accomplish its organization? It is of prime importance that we refuse to allow the issue to become clouded. In a competitive civilization, organized labor is an instrument of power and of potential coercion. It is a weapon with which workers fight for their rights. Organized labor represents a show of power to combat the power of owners and managers. It is a power which can be and has been abused, but in this it is not different from that abuse of power emanating from the people who own and control factories and tools and think first in terms of profit. Indeed, the abuse of power in the industrial history of America, as elsewhere, can be charged up to labor only to a very small degree. The fact that racketeers gain control of unions, and that labor leaders blunder, or sometimes fail in their appreciation of the public interest or of employers' rights, must not be allowed to obscure the real issues in the labor controversy.

The great fight of the moment is on the very issue of whether labor shall be permitted to effect a wholesale organization and make collective bargaining generally acceptable in all areas of our industrial life. The Supreme Court decision upholding the Wagner Labor Law has by no means settled the matter. There are plenty of business men and corporations that mean to do everything in their power to prevent any strong and independent organization of their workers. It would seem that the time has come when the churches and clergy must take a stand. The issue now is sharply drawn. We are either for organized labor with the hazards and inconveniences attendant upon it, or we are against it. It is a time to come out in the open. The matter of the union label on printing may be of no great concern. In a small parish it may be largely in the nature of a gesture, but it is a gesture of importance. It gives support where it ought to be given. It affects the trend of mind in the right direction.

In my own parish I do not feel that the matter can be allowed to stand indefinitely as it is. It appears to me that the issue at stake in the labor situation is more important than consideration for an individual printer. I believe that our printer, though his shop is his own and he does his own work, should belong to the union. I am trying to persuade him, and at the same time I hope to convince the officials of the church that we should patronize a union shop. With a distaste for coercion and a firm belief in democracy, a lot of patience is required. In the meantime if things in this and other matters are not as I would like them, at least nobody is in doubt as to where the minister stands.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 50)

church, a large number of Universalists, and a widening circle of liberals without church affiliation will give us that power. We need substantial contributions for our work, in addition to the dollar-a-year dues. We need the names of persons known to our friends to be, generally speaking, at least as liberal as our program to whom copies of this issue of UNITY may be sent.

This issue of UNITY will be followed by a sequence of articles relating to the platform, to appear in the columns of *The Christian Register* in coming months.

At the coming General Conference of the American Unitarian Association at Niagara Falls there will be two meetings of the U.F.S.J. At 4:00 o'clock October 26, Homer Martin of the Committee for Industrial Organization will speak, the subject, tentatively, "Unionization and Social Justice." At 12:30 p. m. on October 28 there will be a panel discussion on "How Can We Keep America Out of War?" Communications may be addressed to the President of the U.F.S.J. at 301 N. Mayfield Avenue, Chicago, and memberships and contributions sent to the Treasurer, Mrs. Beatrice Wadleigh, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

—EDWIN H. WILSON, President.

UNITARIAN FELLOWSHIP for SOCIAL JUSTICE

Purpose: To sustain one another in united action against social injustice and in the realization of religious ideals in present-day society.

25 Beacon Street
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

PROGRAM AND PLATFORM, 1937-1938

1. The U. F. S. J. proposes to defend and maintain civil and religious liberties, particularly where repressive trends are manifest in the United States, and support the aims and purposes of the American Civil Liberties Union.
2. The U. F. S. J. supports the coöperative movement wherever founded on Rochdale principles and urges its members to affiliate with local coöperatives or to assist in the organization of new coöperatives.
3. The U. F. S. J. urges active participation in agencies working for international understanding, world peace and the removal of the economic and all other causes of war.
4. The U. F. S. J. proposes as a specific project wherever the need is manifest, the defense of our public schools and universities from sectarian and political exploitation; the defense of academic freedom by opposition to teachers' oath bills and to all other invasions of educational democracy.
5. The U. F. S. J. is opposed to compulsory military training in schools and colleges, and to compulsory salutes to the flag.
6. The U. F. S. J. believes that exemption from military service either in time of peace or of war should be granted by law without discrimination to all who believe that war is wrong and conscientiously refuse to bear arms.
7. The U. F. S. J. rejoices that the United States government affirms and upholds the right of workers to organize unions and bargain collectively under leadership of their own choosing and plans of their own design and the U. F. S. J. therefore endorses the legislation recently enacted by the Federal Government to that end.
8. The U. F. S. J. believes that all Unitarian churches and agencies, beginning with the Beacon Press, should demonstrate sympathy with organized labor by having all their printing bear the union label.
9. The U. F. S. J. urges the establishment wherever needed of birth control clinics; it supports the Federal public health service in its campaign to eradicate syphilis and favors public discussion and education along the lines of prevention as well as treatment.
10. The U. F. S. J. believes that it is a responsibility of government to provide all of its citizens with the opportunity for self-support, and that adequate relief should be given by government to all unemployable persons; that government should recognize this as a permanent obligation and provide therefore on a planned stable and continuing basis; that relief should be administered without the infliction of mental cruelty; that self-help coöperatives, governmentally subsidized, offer a means of providing self-support without excessive taxation. The U. F. S. J. urges its members to scrutinize relief set-ups at all times.
11. The U. F. S. J. recommends to its members fraternal coöperation in social action with all religious fellowships and agencies.
12. The U. F. S. J. believes that the relationship between religious idealism with its concern for human welfare and social action must be made clear to the end that discussion of social topics or affairs can never be held irrelevant to Unitarian gatherings and services.
13. The U. F. S. J. recommends the following for study by Unitarians; calling particular attention to the effectiveness of the technique of the New Partnership plan which can be extended to both men and women: Public Ownership. Socialized Medicine. Neutrality Legislation. City Manager Government. Taxation of Church Property. The Cause and Cure of Crime. Proportional Representation. Opposition to the Sales Tax. An International Police Force. Sanctions and the League of Nations Covenant. Crime, Juvenile Delinquency, Penal Conditions. Removing the Stigma of Charity from Old Age Security. Allocation of Taxation in Relation to Ability to Pay. The Responsibilities of Capital, Labor and the Public. (Other pertinent subjects selected locally to be added.)

Mrs. Beatrice Wadleigh, Treasurer
25 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass. .....193....

Please enroll me as a member of the U. F. S. J. for the 1937-1938 season. Enclosed is $..... (minimum dues are $1.00 but more is needed) as my dues. ATTACHED NAMES (IF ANY) ARE PROSPECTIVE MEMBERS FOR THE FELLOWSHIP.

If a member of a Unitarian or other liberal church give name of church here..... Name ..... Address .....

The following persons are socially progressive and should be interested in joining the Fellowship. Please send them literature:

Name ..... Name.....

Street..... City..... Street..... City.....

(Use additional sheets if necessary)